UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,001	11/13/2003	Majid A. Syed		1000
Majid A. Syed	7590 05/02/200	8	EXAM	IINER
1105 Stone Greek Drive Hummelstown, PA 17036			ADE, OGER GARCIA	
Hummeistown,	PA 17030		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3687	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/707,001	SYED ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	GARCIA ADE	3687			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	-		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communica O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 No.	ovember 2003				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits	is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E.					
oloood in absordance with the places and of E.	x parte quayre, 1000 o.b. 11, 10	0.0.210.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ammer. Note the attached Office	ACTION OF IOTHI PTO-152.	•		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	лон друшанон			
· , , ,	, 				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

- 1. The claims are objected to because the lines are crowded too closely together, making reading difficult. Substitute claims with lines one and one-half or double spaced on good quality paper are required. See 37 CFR 1.52(b).
- 2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: grammatical error the word "microntroller" in the body of the claim should be spelled "microcontroller". Appropriate correction is required.
- 3. Claims 2-16 are objected based on their dependency on claims 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 2, 6, 18-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant is required to give a thorough explanation regarding the plethora of acronyms in the claims since "acronym" must be defined. For purpose of examination Applicants need to define the following acronyms: ISM RF, MMI, LED, CATV, and FM/AM in the bodies of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

 Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 8. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanton [US 2005/0040934 A1], in view of Katoh et al [US 2002/0113906 A1], and further in view of Philyaw [US 2004/0210943 A1].

As per claims 1-20, Shanton discloses an addressable receiver display unit mounted on retail shelf [see abstract] comprising: a system to prevent inadvertent

removal of said portable display receiver units from the shelf [see summary of the invention, paragraph 52], having a network access interface [as illustrated in figure 1, and see paragraph 69, read as: *interface to a display and/or provide a parallel or serial communications interface to a host computer or industrial controller*], a display man machine interface for communicating with the unit and a software program to decode input [see paragraphs 52-56]; and an antenna, which is shielded to prevent interference with other wireless systems supplying that detected signal to baseband processor [see paragraphs 55 and 78].

Shanton does not explicitly disclose the access interface is either over ISM RF or either over terrestrial digital commercial FM/AM radio broadcast or over Satellite broadcast network. However Katoh discloses the access interface is either over ISM RF or either over terrestrial digital commercial FM/AM radio broadcast or over Satellite broadcast network [see paragraphs 45 and 46].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the invention was made to modify Shanton's to include Katoh's FM/AM radio broadcast or over Satellite broadcast network. The motivation to combine will provide a receiver and a broadcast signal receiving method through which a customer can easily select [see summary of the invention].

The above combination doest not explicitly disclose a microcontroller. However, Philyaw discloses a microcontroller [see paragraph 92].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the invention was made to modify the above combination to include Philyaw's

controller. The motivation to combine will provide a method for connecting a user PC on a user node, and conversion of data [see summary of the invention].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GARCIA ADE whose telephone number is (571)272-5586. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Gart can be reached on 571.272.3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Garcia Ade Examiner Art Unit 3687

/Vanel Frenel/ Examiner, Art Unit 3687

April 27, 2008